FELLOWSHIP

February 1944 Vol. X—No. 2

The world is suffering from locomotor ataxia. The body of mankind built up and knit together so marvelously by the good gifts of God in Christian civilization has failed, hopelessly failed, to recognize its unity; and so, though physically integrated by radio and airplane, its life is schizophrenic and its activities consequently uncoordinated, spasmodic, meaningless, and self-destructive. . . . Locomotor ataxia is the plainest analogy—locomotor ataxia when the sufferer ceases to be able to control his limbs, or organize his processes, or express his selfhood—locomotor ataxia, a condition far more terrible than the death of which it is the prelude.

— CANON CHARLES E. RAVEN.

Report from the Front

by

EDGAR L. JONES

•

Slaughter of the Innocent by R. Alfred Hassler

Race in the Deep South by Charles R. Bell, Jr.

CPS and the Second Mile by Evan W. Thomas

•

Then and Now in the F.O.R.

by

LEYTON RICHARDS

15 cents a copy

$1.50 a Year

FROM MY STANDPOINT

John Haynes Holmes

In his *An American Diary,* published some two months or more ago, Samuel Grafton has an interesting and important passage about the plain people and their leaders. He writes:

"The plain people of the world have a capacity for confusion but not for betrayal. There has never been a mass Machiavelli. The scoundrel is always the individual; the shameful decisions are taken by men and never by nations."

Thus, it is individuals who take countries into war, and not the peoples of such countries. It is kings, premiers, presidents who do the trick. Which reminds me of a famous passage in William Cowper's great and neglected poem, *The Task!* In Book V he writes:

"But war's a game, which, were their subjects wise,
Kings would not play at. Nations would do well
T'extort their truncheons from the puny hands
Of heroes, whose infirm and baby minds
Are gratified with mischief; and who spoil,
Because men suffer it, their toy the world."

From this conjunction of contemporary and classic testimony it appears that there is a failure somewhere in the people's control of their own affairs. Nations go to war not because the people want to, but because they "suffer it." Were men "wise," says Cowper, they would not allow their kings to "play" at this "game." They would find some way to stop it.

I

A step was taken in this direction when people got rid of kings, and substituted democratic or representative governments. Emerson refers to this transition in his *Boston Hymn,* where he wrote the famous lines:

"God said, I am tired of kings.
I will suffer them no more."

Whereupon the people took over their own political power! And in the United States the war power was placed explicitly by the Constitution in the hands not even of an elected executive but of the Congress, the direct representatives of the voters. The same thing happened in England, where the war power became a prerogative of Parliament. Here was a gain. Yet wars continued!

An attempt to limit even this representative exercise of the war power is seen in the proposal of a popular referendum on war. Under this arrangement, except in case of a direct attack, a nation might not go to war unless the people sanction it by direct vote. This idea was embodied in the proposed Ludlow Amendment to the United States Constitution, which was widely discussed and quite generally supported before the present war. [Note: The referendum was to be held only in the case of America's initiating a state of war. If there were any direct military attack upon the country, the Congress and the President were to have the power to act.]

The most sweeping attempt to limit the exercise of the war power apart from the people's will is that implicit in the great philosophy of the Outlawry of War. Under Outlawry, if it were formally enacted by government, it would be a criminal offense, punishable by law, for any public official, high or low, to advocate war, to foment war, to make occasion for war, or to appeal to the people to go to war. In this situation, to urge war would be to aid and abet a crime. A war leader, under the terms of Outlawry, would be an accessory before the fact. Even if war were advocated by this leader as the sole means of ensuring permanent peace upon the earth, his act would still be a punishable offense. How this would work out in practice, nobody can say. Probably as well as, and no better than, the will of the people would determine!

Perhaps there is no really decisive way of denying to the government, as distinguished from the people, the exercise of the war power, short of the deliberate refusal of the people to fight. That's what the conscientious objectors do—*refuse to fight!* This action in obedience to conscience, duly recognized and respected by the law of the land, is usually interpreted as an attempt on the part of the objector to protect his soul from the guilt of what is regarded as a sin. The CO will die rather than kill a fellow man.

But this action, it should be noted, also involves, at least by implication, the great moral precept of Immanuel Kant: "So live that thy conduct may become a universal rule for men." We are acting now, say the conscientious objectors to war, as we believe all men should act. Our conscience we would have a universal conscience, as the reflection of the universal moral law. Humanity has only to do by general consent what we are doing by individual decision, and it can get rid of war forever. This is the plea and example of the conscientious objector to war, made noble by heroic sacrifice, but ineffective to the extent that conscientious objectors are few in numbers and scant in influence. Yet some day the people generally may refuse to fight, and then at last will come the dawn of peace.

II

What all this means is difficult to determine. Probably that war is a mightier force than can be controlled by any single governmental action, even in the hands of the people themselves! The problem involves tremendous factors of economic and political reform, and deep and wide processes of education and discipline. Yet the simple truth remains that war does not operate of itself—it is no fate or doom imposed upon us. In every war, on both sides of the battle front, there are elements of human responsibility, and these elements, so far as possible, should be taken out of the hands of powerful individuals to whom war may still be a good deal of a "game," and placed in the hands of "the plain people" who have good reason to know war as the final horror of human life.

The war power is too vast and fatal a power to be entrusted to any one person, or group of persons. My own conviction is that it is a power which should be altogether denied to government and people alike. It should be as criminal, i.e., unconstitutional, to wage war as to traffic in slaves or opium. This is the doctrine of Outlawry! But granted that the war power exist at all, then every effort should be made, within the bounds of reason, to place it directly and exclusively with the people who must pay the price of death.

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE } *Editors*

R. ALFRED HASSLER
Managing Editor

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Dorothy Detzer
Eugene Exman
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Helene Hale
John Haynes Holmes
Amos B. Hulen
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Willis J. King
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Donovan E. Smucker
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

FELLOWSHIP

THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

February 1944 **Vol. X—No. 2**

"The deliberate killing of non-combatants is murder. If war degenerates into wilful slaughter of the innocent, Christians must either become pacifists or give up their religion."—Dr. J. H. Oldham, Oct., 1940.

Slaughter of the Innocent

By R. ALFRED HASSLER

IN this fifth year of World War II nothing is clearer than that a nation that gives its approval to participation in modern war, begins a process of progressive moral deterioration that leads eventually to the sanction of the most dreadful acts of torture and destruction. Whatever the high moral purposes for which a nation professes to fight, they must inevitably be degraded and mocked by the inexorable destruction of all moral values that takes place under the guise of "military necessity."

One illustration of this process in the case of the United Nations may be seen in the systematic starvation of non-belligerent Europeans. Another, whose full realities are glossed over by press and radio, is the current "area" or "obliteration" bombing of German cities, a campaign so sadistically cruel that merely to witness its effects would derange the minds of many of those who gloat over the newspaper accounts.

Whole cities are being systematically destroyed, with literally not one stone left upon another. Factories and homes, railroad yards and hospitals, fortifications and churches, alike are blasted and ruined by the periodic visits of hundreds of British and American heavy bombers. And with them are hundreds of thousands of human beings—new-born babies and aged invalids, soldiers and expectant mothers, caught up in an inferno of terror that seems likely to leave its physical and spiritual blight on Europe for generations.

This obliteration bombing is a relatively recent development. As an accepted policy of Anglo-American warfare it appears to have been adopted within the past year, and in its present tempo has been going on only since last June. It is believed to be the product of the fertile imagination of Air Chief Marshall Sir Arthur Harris, described by a fellow official as "a tiger without mercy in his heart."[1]

Sir Arthur, who takes his cue from the policy enunciated officially by Brenden Bracken—"bomb, burn, and ruthlessly destroy"—is the man who has to his credit also the "pacification by bombing" policy by which the British were able to "control" rebellious tribes in the north of India between wars.[2]

The technique of obliteration bombing has a cold efficiency about it worthy of notice. The raid is begun by a group of planes known as "pathfinders." They are piloted by men who have been trained not merely to locate themselves over a given city, but over a given small area of that city. Such location being established, the pathfinders drop target-marking bombs that explode at about 2,500 feet, throwing out brilliant flares that drift slowly down, clearly outlining the target to be hit.[3] Within this small area, sometimes measuring no more than ten blocks each way, successive waves of heavy bombers pour their loads of high explosives and incendiaries—as much as 2,500 tons of bombs within a period of twenty minutes.

The greatest weight of bombs ever dropped on London in a single raid was 450 tons; no more than 7,000 tons have been dropped on London since the start of the war. But in less than two months between November 18, 1943 and January 9, 1944, more than 15,000 tons of high explosives were dropped on Berlin.[4] At the end of the first month of that time, reconnaissance photos showed that 17 per cent of Berlin's buildings had been destroyed or so damaged as to render them useless. *Since December 21 it has been impossible to take more photos because of the great clouds of smoke over-hanging the city,* but it was estimated that at least one house in every four had been rendered uninhabitable by January 10.[5]

Berlin has not been the only target, of course. On the

1 Air Marshall Billy Bishop, speaking in New York, March 29, 1943.

2 *Time,* June 7, 1943.

3 *London Daily Telegraph,* July 27, 1943.

4 *New York Times,* January 9, 1944.

5 New York *Herald-Tribune,* January 11, 1944.

cities of the Ruhr Valley alone the RAF poured 50,000 tons of bombs during 1943. Hamburg, Cologne, Remscheid, Mülheim, Dortmund, Essen, Duisberg, Düsseldorf, Kiel, Aachen, Rostock, Lübeck, Nuremberg, Krefeld, Wuppertal —all are only skeleton cities, some of them abandoned for the duration. More bombs were dropped on Hamburg in ten days last August than fell on London during the eleven-month blitz,[6] with destruction and damage to property estimated at 77 per cent.[7]

This city of almost two million population was described by an RAF spokesman as lying "in absolute ruins. . . . It is probably the most complete blotting out of a city that ever happened." The damage done to Hamburg was about 100 times that inflicted by the Germans on Coventry. In four night attacks 7,000 tons of bombs were dropped and an area of nine square miles devastated.[8]

Cologne in four raids suffered 85 per cent destruction and has been abandoned.[9] On January 14 the RAF poured 2,000 tons of bombs on Brunswick, a city of 200,000 about 110 miles from Berlin. The loosing of this weight of explosives took 23 minutes, which means that in less than a half-hour there was dropped on a city one thirty-fifth the size of London almost five times the heaviest weight of bombs ever dropped on London. In spite of dense clouds, the British airmen still could see the flames when they were 150 miles on their way home.[10]

In the ruins of Hamburg, Düsseldorf and Cologne, according to Air Vice Marshall R.H.M.S. Saundby, "civilized life . . . is no longer possible." He added that seventeen cities in northwest Germany are "liabilities . . . to the enemy war machine," while six more needed only "one more good pasting" to join them. In all, said Saundby, 31 cities in Germany had been hit since last December by 48 attacks of 500 tons or more.[11]

In roughly comparable terms, similar air attacks would have devastated three-quarters of Los Angeles, Cleveland, Baltimore, Boston, New Orleans, Minneapolis, Cincinnati, Newark, Louisville, and St. Paul. "Civilized life" no longer would be possible in Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Buffalo.

Yet all this is only one side of the picture, and the side of less importance. Even cities can be rebuilt in time—though treasures of art and architecture are lost forever—but the thousands of lives that are being destroyed or broken can never be restored. Official German figures, which a well-informed source declares have been accepted as accurate by the British, show 1,200,000 identifiable civilian dead in the raids, besides "tens of thousands" of charred, unidentified corpses. (Britain has lost through bombing, in the whole war, 55,000 civilian dead.)

Hamburg alone lost more than 58,000 dead in the concentrated raids of last summer. Mothers threw their children into the canals so that they might not be caught in the flames. One eye-witness wrote:

"We passed whole streets, squares, and even districts . . . that had been razed. Everywhere were charred corpses, and injured people had been left unattended. We will remember those Hamburg streets as long as we live. Charred adult corpses had shrunk to the size of children. Women were wandering about half crazy. That night, the largest workers' district of the city was wiped out."[12]

One of the Hamburg raiders' bombs was reported to have made a direct hit on the Elbe tunnel, drowning 18,000 persons who had taken refuge there.[13]

Among the bombs dropped in these raids is a type of phosphorus bomb on which neither sand nor water has any effect. A concentration of these in a relatively small area creates a fire that throws flames thousands of feet into the air, forming a chimney that sucks the oxygen out of streets and buildings for blocks around. Against this peril even shelters are useless, becoming traps for people who cannot get out, and so suffocate by the hundreds. A stoker who deserted a German ship at Stockholm told a newspaperman:

"People went mad in the shelters. They screamed and threw themselves, biting and clawing the doors which were locked against them by the wardens."[14]

And the Berlin correspondent for a Swiss newspaper wrote:

"A blanket of fire covering the entire area and rushing up to ever greater heights in one compact body, will suck up the last remains of oxygen from all rooms, shelters, and cellars. At the same time the temperature in the shelters rises unbearably, but the people are prevented from leaving by the constant rain of high explosives, incendiaries, and phosphorus bombs. . . . Those who remain in the shelters were not only suffocated and charred, but reduced to ash."[15]

Another Swiss correspondent wrote of Düsseldorf:

"A high police official told me that 2,500 people were killed during one night of heavy bombardment and that the Provincial Fire Insurance building still covers its victims. 18,000 dwelling houses have been destroyed . . . and 350,000 people rendered homeless. . . . Frightful scenes occurred in Wuppertal, as the city is situated in a valley and possessed narrow streets that made any flight impossible. Numerous victims ran around aimlessly like burning torches until they died."[16]

And so the stories go, multiplied almost endlessly. Half a million homeless in Berlin, with no gas, no electricity, food short and supplies disorganized; towns flooded with water from broken dams but with no safe drinking water—the incredible story of human cruelty poured out on an unprecedented scale, piling up hatred and bitterness and shattered minds upon which to build the new world. (Corder Catchpool reports in *The Friend*[17] that "forty per cent of Germany's war babies are suffering from neurotic and other diseases attributed, amongst other causes, to the physical fear of expectant mothers.")

What will be the result? What price shall we have to pay for this bitterness we have meted out to our fellow men? For assuredly, if this is a moral universe, we shall have to pay for what we are doing! And what about the men who fly the bombers—these gentle, pleasant boys who have been transformed into killers more deadly than Genghis Khan? Perhaps most of them are too occupied with their job, and too caught up in the swift pace of war, to realize now what they are doing. But what will happen to them

6 Edgar Snow in the *Saturday Evening Post*, November 13, 1943.
7 The London *Spectator*, September 24, 1943
8 *London Times*, September 10, 1943.
9 Edgar Snow, ibid.
10 New York *Herald-Tribune*, January 16, 1944.
11 Quoted in *Time*.
12 From the Swiss newspaper *National-Zeitung*, quoted in the British *Reynolds News*, August 8, 1943.
13 *The Daily Telegraph* (London), August 25, 1943.
14 London *Daily Telegraph*, August 25, 1943.
15 From the *Baseler Nachrichten*, September 20, 1943, quoted by Corder Catchpool in *The Friend*, November 19, 1943
16 *Das Volkrecht* (Zurich), October 2, 1943.
17 London, November 19, 1943.

when, in the years to come, they understand the destruction they wrought? And what of those who are confirmed in killing, in whom outright sadism is developed and nurtured by the things they are doing?

Yet this is the nature of modern war. So long as it continues, with unconditional surrender as its only goal, we are in the hands of those whose profession is death. We cannot advise them in their profession, for they are experts. If we suggest to them that they stop this bombing in favor of some other strategy, they will present us with a dilemma: Continue the bombing, they will say, and make the invasion of Europe less costly, or discontinue the bombing and condemn thousands more British and American boys to death in that assault.

They may or may not speak the truth about that; it is relatively unimportant. They are the experts on death, and the people will hear them in the matters of death rather than us. So they pose for men intolerable alternatives, and a search for the "lesser of two evils" is vain. Only when men are willing to confront death with life—to force the dilemma by a creative peace made between equals—can they hope to rescue themselves and the world from chaos.

"My Harp Also Is Turned to Mourning"

Job 30:31.

We talk about the music of the spheres:
But it's a long, long time
Since the morning stars sang together;
It's a long, long time
Since the Sons of God shouted for joy;
A long, long time since the Piper called the tune
And we went off the key.

We talk about the music of the spheres:
Meaning the noises? Meaning the insensate
Din and rough-house of exploding atoms?
Meaning the intermittent whine and shriek
And bang of universes possibly
Expanding? The stupendous, tuneless clamor
And uproar of sidereal revolutions?
But do we know the ordinances of Heaven?

The music of the spheres:
And what of earth?
What of our noisy little spheroid,
Slightly flattened at the poles,
Swimming in discords unresolved?

Is a Master-Musician weaving heavenly harmonies
Out of the horrid jazz of tommy-guns?
Out of the sighs of refugees, the screams of pogroms?
Out of the mingled curses of the victors,
The vanquished, the dictators, and the slaves?
The whisper of conspiracy? The goose-step?
Do you think so?
Is he content to say *pianissimo*
To hylas humming through the nights of spring—
Fortissimo to airplanes—
And leave it at that?
Does he distinguish bomb-blast from sky-thunder?

Tornadoes, typhoons, cyclones,
And all the cosmic instruments of wind,
From the interminable Parley-Voo?
What do you really think?
Is a man a cricket, chirping?
Or is he a responsible thumper of a percussion instrument,
A trumpeter, a piano-tuner,
A harper harping with his harp,
In a Symphony Orchestra?

And does the Leader take the blasphemies,
The sacrilege, the ineptitudes, the mistakes,
Of the violins, trombones, bass-viols, french-horns, piccolos,
Just as they come,
And amiably beam on the ensuing Whoop-La?

O anguished and tormented Ear of God!

Or does he open also their ear to discipline,
And command that they return from iniquity?
Patient is the Master Musician:
Patient but inexorable.
For mark you, it is believed in the face of unbelief,
That he has a norm,
That he sets the tone,
That there is such a thing as concert-pitch—
Believe it or not.

Yea; he strikes the note with his tuning fork:
There be, with ears, that hear.
Hearken, ye tone-deaf!
Listen, ye inattentive!
Come up, come up, ye laggards!

He strikes the note with the Cross.

FLORENCE CONVERSE.

Fascism

A sinuous evil in our neighbor's hay
Crept forth with all its poison yesterday.
"A silver snake!" we cried, "in the long grass.
How can the foolish farmer let it pass?"
The beast draws nearer to our own terrain,
The scaled enormity grows yet more plain.
"A limpid stream! salvation of our all,"
We cry, and let the dismal creature crawl.

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE.

DO AMERICAN SOLDIERS "REVEL IN BLOODSHED"? IS THE WAR BRUTALIZING ALL OUR YOUNG MEN? HERE IS WHAT ONE SOLDIER HAS TO SAY AFTER A YEAR AND A HALF OF WAR—

Report from the Front

By EDGAR L. JONES*

NEARLY every day the papers print interviews with veterans in the armed forces which must be thoroughly distressing to pacifists. Usually such interviews contain a glowing description of "the most beautiful sight in the world"—meaning on varying occasions the spectacle of a German plane exploding in mid-air or of a Japanese ship bursting into flames. In each case the man being interviewed describes his handiwork in vivid words that are strongly reminiscent of young Mussolini's flowery account of bombing Ethiopian cavalry in a story that shocked the "civilized" world a few years ago. If newspaper readers take these interviews to heart, they must be convinced that the young men of America are reveling in bloodshed.

The attitude of the fighting men in the South Pacific I know nothing about, but I can deny most emphatically that the majority of the men fighting against the Germans ever feel the way newspaper interviews pretend that they feel. I was with the British Eighth Army as an ambulance driver on the march from Egypt into Tunisia, and was on an American ship during the invasion of Sicily, and I can report that not only did most fighting men hate the job they were doing, but those who boasted of their prowess as killers were regarded as being in extremely bad taste.

If one reads several newspapers that feature an especially gory interview with the same successful tail gunner, for example, it will be observed that all the stories are worded the same way. They are official accounts worked up by an Army public relations office and distributed to the whole press. This policy of feeding blood to America for breakfast has developed a home front more imbued with lusts for war than the actual battle fronts could possibly be.

If ever men might be expected to enjoy vanquishing an enemy, it was the British Tommies who fought against the Germans in North Africa. None of them had forgotten the great blitz of August-November, 1941, nor their belittling defeat at Dunkirk. Many of them had been chased by Rommel from Benghazi to the outskirts of Alexandria. The Tommies wanted desperately to win in Libya. But they did not hate the Germans who opposed them. They hated Hitler; they hated what Hitler's war had done to them; they hated war itself. Their attitude toward the German soldiers, however, was quite different. For the most part they pitied the men who opposed them, because they felt that the Germans had fallen for a false prophet who had led them only to the Desert, disillusionment, and death. And intermixed with their pity was a respect for the German soldier because he fought hard and well.

In making the statement that most soldiers did not hate the men whom they were fighting, I am fully conscious of the fact that I may be prejudiced by my own pacifistic tendencies. My judgment, however, is based not on personal convictions, but upon facts. German prisoners were not taunted nor mistreated; the enemy wounded were given every care that the British wounded received; and helpless Germans, such as Luftwaffe pilots forced to take to their parachutes, were not harmed. Moreover, although all references to Rommel's men were prefaced by several basic obscenities, the consideration that the Tommies showed for individual Germans revealed that their attitude toward the enemy as a whole did not destroy their inherent principles of decency.

The Soldier and Retribution

In a magazine published in the Middle East for British troops I used to read with great interest the letters written by officers and enlisted men concerning the problem of what to do with Germany after the war. Although none of the letters offered anything startlingly new in the field of post-war planning, nearly all of them were characterized by a tolerant, humane, long-range attitude toward the German people. For example, five out of six men declared that the Allies should not execute Hitler if the Nazi leader should be captured alive. Suggestions ranged from life imprisonment for Hitler to stripping him of all power and employing him as a housepainter on reconstruction projects!

It is a strange commentary on contemporary living when the men exposed to the brunt of the war are more tolerant and more capable of rational thinking than the masses of people whose conception of war is based solely on newspaper headlines and the excited voices of radio announcers.

There is less need to fear that war is making bloodthirsty, heartless machines out of our young men than there is cause for the fighting men to worry over what the war is doing to persons at home who write, "Get a Hun—or a Jap—for me." Men in North Africa and Sicily did not enjoy killing. I have talked with American pilots who spoke of how much they disliked having to strafe helpless troops. Men who have shot down a plane and seen it crash in flames are silent and humble. Not all the men sent back from the front for psychological reasons are suffering from anxiety neuroses; some of them simply can no longer stomach what they are called upon to do. Many a

*FOR member who served as ambulance driver for 17 months in North Africa, was cited for bravery, and then invalided home. His article "The Soldier Returns," was published in the January issue of *Atlantic Monthly*. Mr. Jones is a direct descendant of John and Priscilla Alden.

soldier has told me that the war was making a pacifist of him.

It was always astonishing to me to discover how many men there are in the armed forces who might be classified as conscientious non-objectors. For one reason or another they did not make an issue of their objections to war, but they have got themselves into non-combatant work. They are in medical units, or cooking, or doing desk work, or serving as mess boys, or driving ambulances. I found that being a pacifist among fighting men never brought forth derogatory remarks, so long as one lived up to avowed Christian principles.

Undoubtedly the respect that British and American soldiers had for their German opponents stemmed from the fact that the Germans in North Africa fought hard, and for the most part fought fairly. I heard of only one instance in which a medical unit was deliberately fired upon, and from personal experience I know of several instances when the Germans went to great pains to avoid hitting tents and vehicles marked with red crosses. Nor did Rommel's men indulge in tricks, such as approaching with their hands up and then pulling out a revolver or a hand grenade. The Italians did try such methods, and that is why they were treated with contempt by both the British and Germans. Of course the Germans used all manner of booby traps, but these were considered part of the war.

In battle there is no place for emotions. A fighting man leaves his feelings at home and does not indulge in hate, fear, love, pity, nor the joys of living. He must perform a dull, routine, and seemingly endless job. War is an impersonal business. A bomber crew cannot see the results of its mission except in terms of a glow in the sky. Artillery men seldom know what they are firing at. The infantry kills or gets killed. A soldier becomes mentally atrophied and thinks only of getting home, the sooner the better.

Of course there is a natural satisfaction in hitting a target. A gunner who knocks down a plane has accomplished something, like hitting a clay pigeon, or a tin can tossed into the air. But I do not believe that many men receive any emotional uplift from having killed a fellow human being. Once in a long while I heard a gunner become ecstatic over having scored a direct hit, but he was greeted with disapproving silence by his comrades. There was an American pilot who had the reputation of being enthusiastic about strafing ground troops, and he was regarded as being definitely peculiar. The general reaction to war was neatly summed up by a wounded Scotchman who was asked by a medical orderly to give his religion. "Religion?" the Scotchman shouted. "What religion can a man have who has to do what we are doing?"

According to various articles in newspapers and magazines, American soldiers on the battle fronts are becoming more and more religious. Eye witnesses say that they can be found leaning against a gun barrel reading the Bible, and that church services are well attended. I wish I could substantiate this story. Certainly the Bible occasionally is read in battle areas, but this often is because every soldier invariably is given a pocket Bible to carry with him, and it is the only available reading material. Undoubtedly many men turn to God in moments of stress, as does nearly everyone, but many of them also rub their lucky charms with the same degree of faith. I have been among both British and American troops. The British make more of an effort to have regular church services than do the Americans, but anyone who optimistically proclaims a return to religion must take into consideration the fact that for many months at a time church services are the only form of diversion a soldier has.

I make these comments because I feel that men and women of the Fellowship of Reconciliation are deeply interested in fostering a revival of faith in the Christian way of living. Though many soldiers become aware of spiritual realities during lonely moments of their nightly watches, or during the anxious minutes when their lives depend on circumstances beyond their control, I do not believe that such chance encounters with a supernatural entity can have a lasting effect on most men. I do not believe that many men in a war see the Light in the sense that Paul did. I wish I could believe it, but one must be realistic. The war as a whole is too impersonal to nurture occasional spiritual stimulation. More often war tends to develop man's craving for physical excitement.

A Changed Perspective

At the risk of seeming to contradict myself, I must add that life in a battle area does destroy man's materialistic concepts. That is to say, soldiers who live with the realization that there may be no tomorrow usually change their perspective toward life. They share their food, blankets, and cigarettes with the men around them. They help each other. They risk their lives to assist a stranger, when at home they would have passed by without stopping. They create an atmosphere that makes self-sacrifice the natural way of living. In a sense, they become good Christians. Yet I do not feel that one can be justified in saying that these men have found the true meaning of Christ.

When the majority of the men whom I have encountered in the front lines return home, they will be inwardly humble, uninterested in materialistic comforts other than food and drink, eager to satisfy physical hungers, and in need of spiritual consolation. With varying success they will endeavor to forget the war and to adjust themselves to civilian living. As the war fades from their consciousness, so will the memory of their previous communal existence and of the momentary glimpses some of them had of God.

The churches of America and all Christian-minded men and women have a tremendous responsibility to assist in the rehabilitation of returning soldiers. From my own experience I know that a man back from overseas has a deep-rooted longing for something bigger than himself that he can grasp and from which he can derive strength and satisfaction. Religion has the only answer for this need for spiritual inspiration. Yet a man fresh from war does not think of religion. He expects to find his salvation in physical stimulants, and he comes away hungry.

Nevertheless, a soldier has been through an experience that has changed his whole outlook on life, and in his humble thankfulness for still being alive, he is unconsciously receptive to spiritual guidance. If ever there was a time since the Flood when man has needed God, it is now. By taking the lead in rehabilitating soldiers, many of whom have within them the spark of Christian consciousness, the churches could have a nucleus for the revitalization of Christianity. We have talked often of establishing God's will on earth. The time is now!

Then and Now in the FOR

THE TRIBULATIONS OF PACIFISTS IN TWO WORLD WARS

By LEYTON RICHARDS*

PIONEER movements have a cutting edge that tends to become dulled in the course of time. There are two reasons for this: one is the fact that the pioneer has to think out his own convictions while his successor adopts convictions already tested by experience, and the other is that the pioneer challenges opposition and even persecution while his successor is accepted as a familiar phenomenon and even may find himself socially approved.

This has been the history of all forward movements that have made good. The story of the Christian Church from Pentecost to Constantine is a case in point; so are the record of scientific advance from Galileo and Bruno to Eddington and Jeans, the growth of Nonconformity in England, and the progress of organized labor. That there are subtle spiritual dangers in this substitution of approval for persecution is obvious. When a pioneer movement finally is accepted—even though it be not endorsed—by public opinion, its members are apt to become traditionalist and even to frown upon those who would pioneer still further.

These considerations have been brought to mind by an oft-repeated lament of old friends in the pacifist movement. They compare the period of the last war with the period we are living through now, and they are distressed by the apparent absence of the vim and enterprise that characterized the movement in those earlier days. They tell us that the FOR, for instance, is not what it used to be. They are puzzled by the feeble ripple it makes in wartime public opinion. They expected resentment and they find indifference; they anticipated opposition and they are met by tolerance. So they yearn for some "positive action" that will provoke the storm that refuses even to gather, let alone break.

Of course it may be that we of the original FOR generation have settled upon our lees and become spiritually unenterprising, and that the younger generation lacks the conviction and the courage of its fathers. But, for myself, I do not believe it, nor do I share the laments of those who cry "Ichabod" over the present condition of the pacifist movement. I sympathize with the young folk of today who burn to make a dramatic witness to the pacifist faith that is in them and to emulate the deeds of those who, thirty years ago, "had trial of mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment." For their consolation it should be said that theirs is probably far the harder path to tread. The most searching test of Christian fidelity is not in the dramatic moments of high adventure for the Kingdom of God, when the spirit of the pioneer sustains us, but in the reactions we are called to make amid the humdrum and the commonplace.

In that sense then, the pioneer is not to be exalted above his less romantic successors, *provided* they are as faithful in the use of their opportunity as he was in his. Then how fares the pacifist movement in this estimate? And to answer that question we must try to gauge the difference in the opportunities that confront us as compared with the pioneering days of 1914 onwards. Let me draw upon some personal recollections in underlining that difference.

"Shadowed" by Government Agents

I succeeded Richard Roberts as General Secretary of the [British] FOR in December, 1916. I had just returned from a four months' visit to America in order to follow up the work of Henry Hodgkin earlier in the year in founding the American FOR. The United States was then a neutral, and Woodrow Wilson had just been reelected to the Presidency by a liberal use of the slogan, "Woodrow Wilson Wins Without War." The cinemas were echoing to the then-popular song, "I Didn't Raise My Boy to Be a Soldier," and it was comparatively easy to secure a response to the FOR message from a peace-minded, if not a pacifist-minded, public.

In particular, interest was widespread in the treatment meted out to conscientious objectors in England, and in consequence the British Ambassador in Washington began to take an embarrassing interest in the activity of his pacifist co-national. I was urged by friends in the FOR to communicate with the Ambassador, and Rufus Jones and I addressed a personal letter to him protesting against the "shadowing" of FOR speakers by British agents in a neutral country. I have told the story in detail in my book, *The Christian's Alternative to War,* but the upshot was that I was promptly arrested on arrival in Liverpool and marched to the police station between two stalwart detectives.

So began the excitement of pioneering; and I do not deny the zest with which one was able to testify to one's faith. The case was dropped through the inability of the Crown to subpoena witnesses from America in order to prove its case for "subversive activities"; but it led on to an intimate acquaintance with Scotland Yard, and rarely a week passed without the heavy tread of Inspector Parker and his "footman" upon the stair at 17 Red Lion Square [the FOR office]. They always hunted in couples so that they could swear to each other's evidence, if need be. After a friendly cup of tea (during which we discussed anything from the weather to detectives in modern fiction), the real purpose of the visit was disclosed. Sometimes it was an order to search our literature files, sometimes a demand for information concerning some of our members (a demand which invariably disclosed a defective memory on our part), sometimes a list of forthcoming meetings was required, once a summons was served upon the editor of *The Venturer* (the precursor of *The Christian Pacifist*) for publishing an article I had written in support of Lord Lansdowne's famous "Letter."

Then came the day when Inspector Parker drove up in a furniture van, armed with a warrant to seize "all papers, goods and equipment which were being used *or likely to be used* in ways which might prejudice the prosecution of

*The Rev. Leyton Richards was third in the succession of secretaries of the British FOR and later the minister of the famous Carrs Lane Congregational Church in Birmingham. He is at present Warden of Woodbrooke, the Quaker College at Selly Oak. This article first appeared in *The Christian Pacifist* for October, 1943.

the war." We gave tea that time to six furniture removers in addition to our friends from Scotland Yard, and it took them the best part of a day to clear our shelves of every scrap of printed paper and of all our stocks of pamphlets, books, and even writing paper (with its incriminating reference to "Reconciliation"). Then they proceeded to tear up the carpets and linoleums from the office floors in a further search for dangerous documents, and we were left at last much in the position of Mother Hubbard, with cupboards that were bare and desks that were empty. That is what pioneering meant in those days. Exciting, yes; but a tiresome and profitless interruption to the work we were there to do.

Then, there were the frequent attendances at court to watch a case in progress or for private cross-examination by a police superintendent. There were also journeys to a distant destination only to find that the lessees of the hall had cancelled the "let" under pressure either from public opinion or from undisclosed official sources. Henry Hodgkin and I once toured England and Scotland for a series of meetings, and wherever we went we were dogged by a couple of obvious policemen in plain clothes; sometimes we and they stayed in the same hotel and we had a pleasant chat together after the late evening meal. I think it was this which disarmed their hostile intentions, for it slowly soaked into their routine-ridden minds that here were not sedition-mongers but only misguided idealists. The climax came on a dark wet night when they obviously preferred the fire in the hotel lounge to a battle with the rain and wind outside; were we going to say the same things tonight, they asked, that we had said the night before? We assured them that, in substance, it was so; then, would we mind (!) if they didn't come along?

The Dangers of Pioneering

But the tribulations of pioneering were not confined to the Chairman and Secretary of the FOR; and in any case they were irritations rather than tribulations. Not so, however, with some of the members. There was, for instance, the famous case of the caravan sent out from the first FOR Summer Conference at Swanwick in 1915. A group of campers, led by Maude Royden, started out to proclaim the gospel of Reconciliation on village greens and in market places and other open spaces. I can see them now as they left Swanwick for their first meeting at Hinckley in Leicestershire. It was pioneering after the manner of George Fox and John Wesley, and it was a courageous venture in the then state of public opinion; but the first meeting was the last and the caravan got no farther than Hinckley. For in the dead of night the campers were attacked by a mob of outraged citizens who set fire to the caravan and rushed upon the pioneers with sticks and stones. They escaped with their lives, but with nothing else; and the police bundled them into safety by stopping a passing train bound for London. No word of the episode appeared in the papers. Hinckley was apparently proud of its hooligans, and the defeated pioneers could only reflect ruefully that the "blood of the martyrs" is not always "the seed of the church!"

On one occasion we had in a barn among other articles a printing press used for the publication of *The Tribunal* (the weekly organ of the No-Conscription Fellowship), which had been banned by the police, and persistent efforts were made by Scotland Yard to discover its whereabouts. How nearly they succeeded only a few of us knew. "Any machinery?" asked a police inspector who had suddenly appeared out of the blue for purposes of interrogation. He was shown into the shed where farm implements were kept. Those not in use were covered with tarpaulins to protect them from a leaky roof, and he actually put his hand on the printing press with the inquiry "Chaff-cutter, I suppose?" The question fell upon deaf ears, and he passed on; but what would have happened if he had lifted the tarpaulin?

Better Work Today

I could unfold a much longer tale; but I have said enough to show that the days of pioneering presented handicaps to an effective witness which those who yearn for them do not always take into account. My own firm opinion is that better and more effective work can be, and is being, done in these days than in those. Allow, as we must, that dramatic situations sometimes arose which focused attention upon the pacifist case; but was it these which commended the case, or the quieter and more obscure occasions when the case was not surrounded by irrelevant passions and when sweet reasonableness and persuasion had a chance? I have known both, and unhesitatingly I plump for the latter.

On the whole, therefore, I welcome the passing of the pioneer stage, and I rejoice both in the wisdom and in the charity that accord to us in these days opportunities angrily denied thirty years ago. I am aware, of course, that there are young men and women today who are paying a heavy price for their pacifist convictions. In a few cases they have been the victims of brutality such as their fathers knew, but for the most part the price is spiritual and is found in the sense of frustration that besets everyone whose vocation is stultified or whose witness is stifled. It is not easy in such circumstances to remain faithful; one function of the FOR now, as in bygone days, is to befriend and support all who in difficult situations seek to be loyal to the truth as they see it.

Nevertheless, it is both right and encouraging to take account of the better understanding of the pacifist movement which distinguishes these days from those of 1914-18. Most significant of all to those who were in the thick of the earlier struggle is the changed attitude of the churches; then, it was for the most part hardly disguised enmity, but now it generally moves between the poles of cold tolerance on the one hand and warm sympathy on the other. The attitude still falls far short of agreement, but there is a note of "I would if I could" about much that is said of the pacifist position. The same is true even of the world outside the churches. Moreover, the pacifist movement itself has changed, and much of the hard antagonism that characterized the pioneer days has dissolved. We have come to appreciate the difficulties that beset governments and peoples alike in a world at war, and we realize now as we did not then that they and we have the same ultimate aim in view. We all seek a world at peace, and our differences are a matter of method. Those differences cut deep; for they go down in the last issue to the truth embodied in the Christian gospel. But to understand that fact is the first step in any final reconciliation between us and our fellow citizens, and between all of us and the God and Father of us all.

A Southern white minister considers his people's attitude toward the Negroes, and the best methods of improving the situation.

Race in the Deep South

By CHARLES R. BELL, Jr.*

IT is rather generally recognized, even by Southerners, that the center of America's race problem is the South. Other parts of the nation may have race difficulties, but no region of the United States has such a large racial minority, with such intense feeling, as does the South. The problem with the Japanese, for example, involves fewer than 150,000 persons and has been an issue for less than two generations. The Negro question includes 13,000,000 colored citizens, most of whom live south of the Mason-Dixon Line, who have been the center of bitter controversy for two centuries or more. If the Southern Negro cannot be given the privileges of democracy, it must be confessed that the greatest of our race problems remains dangerously unsolved.

None can deny the remarkable progress made by the Southern Negro during the last decade. It has not been a well-rounded progress, but tremendous advances have been made along some lines. Now that progress must enlarge its scope if it is to continue. The Negro cannot advance much farther along the road of cultural achievement and creativity within the present bounds of social and economic inequality.

White people are faced with the fact that they have assisted in the liberation and education of the Negro up to this point. They have taken people who formerly did little more than the crudest manual labor, and trained tens of thousands of them to become responsible persons in a highly developed social structure. The problem centers in the fact that while the Negro has made great educational and economic advancement within recent years, he is still expected to live under the confining social restrictions thrown around his ancestors.

Surely it must be obvious that no people can bridge such a chasm. The Negro, whose mental and spiritual capacities have so matured, cannot be expected to remain socially adolescent. This is the problem facing the South today. It has millions of people whom it has taught and trained for vital citizenship and productivity, but to whom it has not permitted any substantial use for that training in the community life. The real question of the hour is whether these restrictions can be discarded and the development of the colored people carried forward.

Unfortunately, many efforts intended to help in the problem generate more heat than light. Some refer to the "race problem" who do not know what that problem is. Others see only one side of it—the "servant problem," for example. Still others are hammering away on points where their work itself is creating further and more serious difficulties.

Any effective solution must begin with certain basic facts about the South today. No one who does not understand these facts and take them into account, can hope to contribute substantially to any sound solution.

To begin with, the South is desperately poor. Its poverty is an old story, of course, but the direct effect of that poverty on race relations is not so well known. Obviously, there is less wealth to be divided, and since the colored people are poorer as a group, it follows that they suffer most. But few people realize that the South's poverty has induced an inferiority complex in the Southern mind that complicates the race issue immensely.

A second basic fact is the lack of any effective channel for political reform. In the North each party makes a bid for the Negro vote, and consequently the Negro can make certain demands for reform. In the South this channel is largely closed. The Democratic Party is entrenched in power and it stands squarely and openly against any change in the race issue. Most Negroes will not risk losing their jobs or facing other forms of increased discrimination simply for the privilege of voting. Consequently, the Negro does not vote in the South.

In this connection, it must be remembered that Southern whites in general believe in, and stand firmly behind, the traditional idea that this is a white man's land. They *believe* in white supremacy. The community is in white hands, and wherever possible complete separation of the races exists. In theory and in fact a duality is deeply entrenched, and especially formidable and dangerous because it has the support of people otherwise enlightened and progressive.

However, there is a note of hope. Some Southerners, including persons of both races, have discarded the traditions of the past and are quietly working for a real community. They seek to obtain for the Negro full and complete participation in life, unhampered by any discrimination. Small interracial groups get together here and there; a housewife and her Negro cook will sit down quietly and break bread together, discussing their hopes and problems; two ministers, one colored and one white, come to have a deep friendship for each other. These, and similar healing activities, are going on constantly in the South. They are not mentioned in the papers, but they are taking place, and in increasing numbers.

The question then is: "In light of these facts, what is the best approach to the race question?"

The White Man's Attitude

I suggest that we must begin with the white man's attitude toward the Negro. Many a white person who appears to be guilty of race prejudice, in reality has little more than a marked and deep-seated aversion to ignorance, uncleanliness, and poverty. The average Southerner rarely sees a

*Pastor of the Parker Memorial Baptist Church, Anniston, Ala.

well-dressed, educated Negro. Most of his contacts are with Negroes who do manual labor, speak and dress poorly, and bathe seldom. It is only natural that some transference of prejudice should have taken place because of this, yet at root it is not a prejudice against the Negro, but a dislike of these other things.

The point of beginning, therefore, is to get the whites to understand the real difference between a Negro who has had the chance to acquire education and economic independence, and the ignorant, poverty-stricken Negro who has not had these opportunities. What most Southerners really fear is the latter, who is a drag on the progress of civilization just as is anyone who suffers from these encumbrances.

I think it has been demonstrated thoroughly that when a Negro manages to escape from the lowest income brackets, he likewise rises above much of the racial discrimination to which he was formerly subjected. If the South can be brought to see that the Negroes themselves fall into different categories, exactly as do those of other races, and therefore should not be treated alike on the basis of color, a great step forward will have been taken. A second step then will follow quite naturally.

Those Negroes who are capable of taking the lead must work with whites who have vision and courage to put on demonstrations of Christian race relationships that the people may see, rather than merely hear about. Argument and discussion have their place, but nothing so completely carries the point home as does seeing the ideal in action. Many Southerners never have seen the Negro in other than an inferior and undesirable position. Any talk about changing this situation leads them to deeper commitment against it. But again and again someone who has seen the Negro in a different role has been completely disarmed and made to see the whole problem in a new light.

A young Southern minister tells of such an experience he had in a Northern seminary when a Negro student sat next to him in refectory. The first time came as a great shock, but as time passed and the incident was repeated the shock wore off. He came to know some Negro students and soon, almost imperceptibly, the transformation had taken place. He simply had to admit the value and desirability of this new way of life as compared to the old one. He might have argued endlessly on the point in a discussion, but there was not much he could say against such a powerful demonstration that where the lot of the black man obviously had been lifted, the place of the white man likewise had been improved, and the two together had found a new community with each other.

At this point something should be said about the tremendous opportunity the churches have to *demonstrate* this aspect of the Kingdom instead of merely talking about it. One very fertile field is the summer retreat, ashram, or camp. Give a selected group of people a chance to see how a Christian community functions in the matter of race problems. It works wonders! Then of course there is the important matter of permitting Negroes to sit in white congregations. This, too, is coming, though slowly.

The Matter of Intermarriage

The last step has to do with the final barricade upon which white race prejudice in the South rests: the fear of intermarriage between the races. Few people who have not lived where large numbers of whites and blacks dwell side by side can appreciate the panic and horror the mere mention of this subject creates in the South. Whites who stand out fearlessly against many of the injustices suffered by the Negro, draw the line at what they call "social equality." They are anxious to help the Negro. They want to give him what they call a "fair deal," which means that he shall be given his dues in so far as that is possible under the present dualism of our society. But as they see it, any move that permits what could eventually lead to intermarriage must not be tolerated. Racial good will would make a tremendous stride forward but for this one final objection, and no satisfactory progress will come until the problem is met honestly. How then shall we meet it?

For a long time I have had the conviction that those who raise this objection should be confronted squarely with something they seem never to have thought about, namely, that marriage is a personal affair with social aspects, not a social problem with personal aspects! As to whether intermarriage is desirable is beside the point. No great races ever yet have lived side by side without some intermingling of blood, but degradation of one race by another in no sense will add to the well-being of either group.

On a boat going to Bombay several years ago was an English girl, on her way to marry an Indian. An English gentleman on board, hearing of her plans, offered to pay her return passage if she would consent to break the engagement. I, for one, feel that her marriage was entirely her own business, but under no condition should the prospect of such unions be an excuse for degradation of the Indian people as a whole. Many of us would not relish seeing our children marry into certain Asiatic stocks, or even, perhaps, into certain European nationalities. The great difference in cultural background and other problems involved would make the union unwanted so far as we personally are concerned. Yet by no means would we wish to see these people deprived of their rights as men and women! And even in such a situation the charm and worth of the person involved might outweigh all the disadvantages.

If the South can be shown that this fear is not a major difficulty in the way, but something artificially projected into the problem, the last great obstacle will have been removed.

C. O. Trial

Here is the place a black-robed judge protects
The Law's austere, inflexible intent,
Ruling as immaterial, incompetent
The word of Conscience, which the Law suspects.
Here blinded Justice with her scales will seek
To balance Truth; but Justice never saw
The stern, exact inequities of Law
Redressed by Mercy and the Other Cheek.
Here stands the valiant, smilingly to wait
For Man to speak the immolating word—
So confident, so honest, so absurd,
While Honor beckons from a prison gate.
He stoops to taste his bitter Rubicon
And hears a voice say: My Belovéd Son.

EDWIN MCNEILL POTEAT.

CPS and the Second Mile

By EVAN W. THOMAS*

THE issue of pacifist support of CPS camps is nothing like as complex as many pacifists seem to believe. When all is said and done it boils down to the question: is the love in which pacifists believe to be linked with government coercion and punitive measures or is it to be a voluntary expression of genuine good will? Going the second mile is good Christian action, but the real question is whether Christians believe in forcing everyone to go the second mile regardless of whether the particular second mile of some Christians meets the conscience of others. The entire point of Jesus' injunction to go the second mile was to get away from legal compulsion and show the individual's voluntary good will.

The agreement made between the Historic Peace Churches and the Selective Service disregards this crux of Jesus' meaning. Consequently, however well meant, it is not a valid expression of Christian love but a legal bargain, in which all real authority is kept in the hands of a Selective Service manned by military officers. This is the hard and bitter fact that pacifists must face.

When the plan for pacifist-maintained camps for COs was first proposed I objected to it, partly on the grounds that it seemed to me very much like buying privilege. I was not then aware that Selective Service would dominate CPS so completely. I took it for granted that the Historic Peace Churches would get something more than nominal control. Since that time actual events as well as documents from Selective Service have disillusioned me convincingly. Pacifists are not buying privilege, but paying for concentration camps or government labor camps, whichever label one wishes to choose. Furthermore, they are paying for those camps not alone with their own voluntary contributions but with the enforced labor, without pay, of the COs themselves.

It is one thing for individuals or like-minded groups to offer service without pay. It is another thing, unsocial and unjust, to force men to work without pay. Yet this is what the agreement between the Historic Peace Churches and the government has meant in practice.

This is a monstrous fact and represents the first time in America's history that any such proposal has even been considered. To call this going the second mile is to make a mockery of good will and love. Behind it is the entire coercive power of a government at war. There is nothing voluntary about it, however sincere and fine the motives that led to the original proposal by the Historic Peace Churches. Pacifists, like all other people, must look at more than good intentions; they must examine critically the methods used. Large numbers of people supporting the war have intentions every bit as good as those of pacifists. The methods of the CPS set-up are not those of love but of coercion. Individuals motivated by love can still express themselves in the very limited surroundings and opportunities of the camps, whoever directs them, but from a social point of view true love strives for the best social principles and the greatest opportunities for service. Strange as it may seem to some, that accounts for the presence of many COs in prison today.

It is a matter for the individual conscience to decide whether one chooses to render alternative service or go to prison. But that does not mean that pacifist organizations have any place in supporting the compulsion of government in forcing COs into labor camps without pay. By agreeing to do this pacifists in America have abandoned their birthright for a mess of pottage. Not only have they become involved in the administration of conscription, but it has warped their thinking so that they are unable to distinguish between the principle of love and that of coercion.

There is no real distinction between the CPS camps directed by the Historic Peace Churches and those directly under the government, except that in the former case the church voluntarily accepts responsibility for administering conscription under Selective Service. The same general rules apply to all camps and the same privileges. The only distinction between the two kinds of camps is that many COs prefer directors chosen by the Historic Peace Churches. Is this worth the price paid for it? Is it worth the warping of thought and honesty brought about by cooperation with Selective Service? Is it worth active participation in the administration of a system that makes conscience a crime and has condemned almost 2,500 COs to prison?

Cannot Oppose and Cooperate

One cannot oppose conscription and cooperate in its enforcement. COs may choose between enforced labor outside of prison and in prison, but religious societies are paying for the maintenance of conscription by their agreement to direct CPS camps under Selective Service. To do this they are willing to abrogate the law of love and put their trust in coercion. The agreement means that religious groups, on their own initiative, have chosen to cooperate with a system that imposes prison sentences of three to five years on many pacifists. That is coercion with a vengeance. Yet the FOR has decided to continue its support of the NSBRO.

Is this what the members want? If not, they must change the decision of the National Council, which yielded to the members' wishes, or prove that the facts as stated are wrong. They must prove that the NSBRO is not cooperating in fact with military officers in administering camps. They must prove that the NSBRO by its activities is not complacently acquiescing in and even supporting the imprisonment of COs who leave their camps. They must prove that the CPS set-up is actually voluntary and that no CO is compelled to work without pay because some pacifists prefer not to be paid. They must prove that pacifists have not helped to establish a plan of alternative service that violates the sociological principles of any enlightened society. Proof must be founded on facts, not rationalization of facts or good intentions. Without this proof, does the FOR wish to pay so terrible a price for a mistaken idea of what constitutes the second mile?

*National Chairman, War Resisters League; Member, FOR National Council.

President and Army Push Labor Draft

President Roosevelt's demand that Congress pass a "national service"—read "universal conscription"—act, included in his January 11 message to that body, has launched what promises to be one of the most bitterly contested legislative struggles of the war.

Supporting the legislation is not only the immense personal prestige of the President, but the united strength of the army administration, headed by Secretary of War Stimson; such widely read news commentators as Walter Lippmann, and a considerable section of the press. Favoring it also is widespread public indignation concerning war-time strikes, which has been encouraged by reams of misinformation and misinterpretation published by the largely anti-labor American press.

Opposing it is organized labor, which lost no time in reaffirming its dislike of the proposed legislation, and the scattered, unorganized, and largely inarticulate forces of liberalism.

Early reaction to the President's message implied that the chances of passage of such a bill just now are poor. Congressmen facing an election year, it was pointed out, would be wary of antagonizing the large labor vote. Moreover, the general public, convinced that the "crest" of the war effort has been passed and that victory is now certain, is not sold on the need for such a bill.

Proponents of the bill have indicated, however, that they are committed to an "all-out" effort to insure its passage. Their opening gun was fired on January 19, when Secretary Stimson told the Senate Military Affairs Committee that the lives of millions of service men might depend on the enactment of labor conscription, and that many troops feel that the "home front" is "going sour."

The bill now under consideration—the Austin-Wadsworth Bill — would make men between the ages of eighteen and sixty-five and women between the ages of eighteen and fifty, with certain exceptions, liable to the draft. Penalties included provide a maximum of six months imprisonment and $1,000 fine. At present there is no provision for conscientious objectors.

Child Labor Increases

The National Child Labor Committee, 419 Fourth Avenue, New York, declares that child labor has more than trebled since the war began, and is contributing greatly to the increasing juvenile delinquency.

Oppose Conscription

Enactment of the proposed universal conscription legislation would be another severe blow at democracy and freedom. Register your feelings now with your Senators and Representative, with the President, and with the House and Senate Military Affairs Committees.

Bear in mind that failure of the Austin-Wadsworth Bill to pass at once does not mean that the danger has been eliminated. Keep up constant pressure on your legislators, and carry on educational work in your local communities by writing letters to newspapers and by organizing church and other discussion groups.

Information about the dangers of the labor draft may be obtained from any office of the Fellowship, or from the Committee Opposing the Conscription of Women, 1924 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

CPS Men Fast for COs in Prison

CPS men in Camp Pocomoke, at Powellsville, Maryland, addressed a "note of fellowship" to conscientious objectors in prison on December 8, after devoting a day to fasting, meditation, and discussion. Pointing out that men of the camp were sending the money saved by giving up 164 meals, to the National Committee on Conscientious Objectors for aid to men in prisons, the Pocomoke letter declared:

". . . We cannot shake your hands or talk to you. We can only reach you in this indirect way. But we are with you. We have not forgotten you, because you are part of us. . . . We have the same goal—a world in which men do not die at the hands of other men. We are with you in thought, in prayer, in hopes, in ideals."

Help Wanted—Maybe

Several factors, including the possibility of future expansion, may develop openings for various positions on the national staff of the Fellowship. Members who might be interested in such work, or who know persons who might be interested, are invited to write to John Swomley at the national office.

Twenty-One End Strike at Danbury

Twenty-one COs on work strike in Danbury (Conn.) prison ended their action two days before Christmas when Warden Myrl Alexander proposed a program of gradual elimination of race segregation in the prison dining-hall. The strike had been undertaken as a protest against a former refusal to establish an "interracial table" in the segregated dining-room.

The warden's proposal called for the gradual substitution of the cafeteria style for the former eating arrangements, with the understanding that under the new plan men might sit with whom they pleased. The cafeteria style was to be inaugurated on New Year's Eve, would be used on one or two occasions during January, and installed as a permanent fixture for the evening meal about February 1. It would then be put into practice for all meals over a period of several months, the exact timing to depend on the reaction of the prisoners and general conditions in the prison.

Termination of the strike was followed at once by the announcement by five of the men that they would continue on strike on the ground that the government had no right to imprison them as conscientious objectors and that they could not in good conscience submit to the injustice being imposed upon them. The five were Ernest Allyn Smith, George Kingsley, Lowell Naeve, Joseph M. Czarniecki, and David Wieck. During January two more COs joined the strikers, bringing the total to seven.

Urge CO Commission

Appointment of a presidential commission to study the whole question of Selective Service and conscientious objectors has been proposed by men of CPS Camp 108, at Gatlinburg, Tennessee. Citing a similar move during World War I, the proposal suggests that such a commission might study questions of uniform classification, civilian direction, prison parole, and similar matters.

To Resist Conscription

Distribute copies of the FOR flyer,

"Help Stop the Drift Toward Total Conscription"

$1.00 per 100; $3.50 per 500; $6.00 per 1,000

Literature Department

2929 B'way, New York 25, N. Y.

Pacifists Discuss World Government

Specific proposals for the political set-up of a peaceful world order will soon be sent for discussion and consideration to pacifist leaders and groups across the country. After such modification and changes as seem necessary in the light of the reaction of those who study the preliminary proposals, they are expected to be released for public consumption under the auspices of the Peace Strategy Board.

The plan developed out of a recent meeting of the Board, at which papers were presented by Mark Shaw and Albert Beverage, of the National Council for the Prevention of War; A. J. Muste, of the Fellowship of Reconciliation; and Theodore Paullin, of the Pacifist Research Bureau. The papers included discussions of the political background of the war, the principles of peace, the conditions of armistice and a peace "treaty," and the possible structure of world government. The last, presented by Mr. Paullin, outlined in considerable detail possible forms of world order either through "functional agencies" or actual world government, without the usual preoccupation with the "need" for military force to maintain it.

The papers are being condensed and edited and will be sent shortly to FOR groups, Friends meetings, and other peace groups across the country. Plans also are being made for their presentation in popular form through the Fellowship Studybooks series.

FORERUNNERS Hold Pittsburgh Conference

One hundred high-school age young people registered for the first Forerunners-sponsored conference, held in Pittsburgh during Christmas week. Leaders of the conference were Bayard Rustin, Perry Saito, John Swomley, and Vadakan P. Thomas. Two more conferences are scheduled for Omaha and Beatrice, Nebraska, for the last week of this month.

Bayard Rustin Facing Prison

Bayard Rustin, co-secretary of the Fellowship's new Race Relations Department, has been indicted for refusal to report for physical examination, and is at present free on $500 bail. The date of his trial had not yet been set when this issue of *Fellowship* went to press. Like other violators of the Selective Service Act, he faces a maximum prison term of five years.

Jottings

Milton Mayer, author of *I Think I'll Sit This One Out,* which appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post* in 1939, hasn't changed his mind. On appeal from a 1-A classification by his draft board, Mayer is reported to have said he'll sit the war out in a penitentiary rather than fight.

* * *

Southern engineers sent to leased American bases in the British West Indies have been learning democracy the hard way, according to a recent article by Oliver Kirkpatrick in the *New Republic.* The Southerners, accustomed to Jim Crow, were set back on their heels when they tried to enforce it in the segregation-free islands. Those who took the law into their own hands received blow for blow, and one group were arrested by Negro police, tried before a Negro judge, and prosecuted by a Negro attorney. They got off with a severe lecture and a warning.

* * *

The Greencastle (Ind.) Methodist Youth "Conference on World Order," originally scheduled for January 15, has been postponed indefinitely. The program committee took this action after it had been unable to find a "host church" that would permit a Japanese-American leader on the platform.

* * *

The Rev. Howard Kester on January 9 was installed as principal of the Penn School (a Negro school) at St. Helena Island, S. C.

* * *

Church Management, a monthly magazine, has called on the church to recognize the "moral issues" of the war and to realize that the "guilty must be penalized." "No academic palaver about British imperialism or the injustices of the peace of Versailles," declares the magazine, "can conceal the guilt of Germany, Italy, and Japan in the present conflict."

But Senator Wheeler called to the attention of the Senate an editorial that appeared in the "authoritative" British magazine, *The Nineteenth Century and After.* The editorial, too long to quote in full, recalls the importance to England of the "balance of power" policy in such statements as these: "Better a despotically governed Germany that is not too strong than a liberal Germany that is too strong"; "England fought (in the Second World War) to preserve the balance (of power)—for that reason and no other"; "Had Germany been the home of enlightenment, progress, and political freedom . . . (England) would nonetheless have been under the absolute necessity of maintaining the balance, for survival must always come first, political complexion second."

And morality—where?

Don't Forget

to send in

Your Subscription

to the

Fellowship Studybooks

Pattern for Peacemakers — Exit Empire — The Next Peace — etc.

Five issues — $1.00

Literature Dep't

2929 B'way, New York 25, N. Y.

February is

RACE RELATIONS MONTH

Here is some good reading matter for your own study or for distribution:

INTERRACIAL PRIMER
By Bayard Rustin..... 15¢

WHAT THE BIBLE TEACHES ABOUT FREEDOM
By A. J. Muste..... 5¢

INTERRACIAL BROTHERHOOD
By National Council of the FOR ..... $2 per 100

HOW TO PREVENT A RACE RIOT
By Winifred Raushenbush.. 10¢

BROTHER JIM CROW
By James Rorty..... 10¢

WHAT CAUSED THE DETROIT RIOT!
By Walter White & Thurgood Marshall ..... 10¢

THE RACES OF MANKIND
By Ruth Benedict & Gene Weltfish ..... 10¢

Literature Dep't

2929 B'way, New York 25, N. Y.

FOR Field Secretaries

South: Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville 4, Tenn.; *Midwest:* Roger Axford, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.; *Northern California:* Jean G. McKay, 2151 Vine Street, Berkeley 7, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, 1837 N. Berendo Street, Los Angeles 27, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Rohrer, 440 East 13th Avenue, Denver 3, Colo.; *Rural:* Warren Nelson, Prairie du Sac, Wis.; *Refugee:* Marion Frenyear, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

Pro and Con

A PAGE OF COMMENT BY READERS

Readers are invited to contribute to this page. Please keep letters brief, since space is severely limited.

The War Program

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Enclosed is my application for membership, and a little contribution to your noble cause. To my mind, your organization is the most important in America, and I only wish it received the publicity it deserves.

Unfortunately most men and women who have otherwise worked for decent causes, have been so beset with fear and emotion with regard to Nazism and the *possible* state of the world if the war had been won by Germany and Japan, they have closed their eyes to everything else. And the ridiculous part of their hysteria is that *now,* when there is no *chance* of a military victory by either of the Axis nations, they *still* go on acting as though there were. In fact, it is apparent that the "United" nations are the aggressors now on all fronts, and *more* apparent that their leaders are prompted to continue the slaughter for their own personal power and prestige and have no intention of striving for a peaceful world based on cooperation and the brotherhood of man. But still, the "liberals" continue to crusade for "victory" instead of peace. It is almost unbelievable that intelligent people have gone on so blindly. Their original fear and hysteria is understandable though unwarranted, but their attitude since our leaders proclaimed "unconditional surrender" as the *only* terms for peace is entirely childish and unrealistic particularly when most of these liberals spend all their time pointing out the inconsistencies and hypocrisies of Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin, to say nothing of the brutality and corruptness of Chiang Kai-shek.

As for myself, I am more upset by the cruelty of *our* program (that is the United Nations program) than I was at the ruthlessness of the Nazis. I expected it from them, and it only helped to antagonize the world against such methods. But now since our leaders have even gone their "enemy" one better, the poor oppressed peoples do not know where to turn. And we war resisters, who loathe this present program of hate and massacre, have no way of making ourselves heard, nor could we reassure the people of Europe and Asia because it looks as though our leaders were going to make their lives even more miserable than before.

JO CANTINE

Truth and Techniques

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

God is Truth. Truth is eternal, unchanging, unaltered by time and space, unaffected by what we do, and speaks to all alike. There is Truth and there is self. But Truth and self cannot exist together, for Truth leads to the forgetfulness of self, to an absolute oneness of *all* life. If we could know Truth, we would know real friendship. We would feel no existence apart from others.

When we feel this oneness of life then what happens to one individual also happens to us. We are both the discriminated against and the discriminator, the offended and the offender, the prosecuted and the prosecutor. Feeling a part of both we cannot use force or pressure against one in order to force him to do what *we* think he should do.

Fasting as a technique to gain our way is a very strong pressure which takes an unfair advantage of the goodness in the hearts of those who temporarily may have authority over us. What we really want is to find that spirit which includes us all. The stronger our spirit the less thought we need to give to techniques." The weaker our spirit the more we rely upon "techniques" to "overcome evil." Real love can overcome evil, but we must never consider love as a technique for righting our wrongs. We should love people not because we want to change them, but simply love them as they are and as they may remain. We must love man, but we must love Truth more than man. If we love man more than Truth, then in our effort to relieve man of his sorrow and suffering we may lose our own way and become confused and lost or we may lead him even deeper into the mire. Only the way of Truth can save man. In our search for Truth we may appear cruel and indifferent, for we must rise above the feeling of righteous indignation at the sight of wrongs inflicted upon an individual or a group. Only by being detached can we see things as they *really* are and only then can we aid in solving our problems.

If we could gain a greater awareness of life we would not only know the pain, suffering and problems of mankind but we would know the *real* cause of these and the right method of correcting them. Life follows the law of cause and effect. Often we strike at the effect rather than the cause. The cause of our suffering and of the division among us is the impurity of our spirits, the lust and greed within us. We cannot purify the spirit of another. All men should follow that which appears right to them. We should withdraw our support from that which seems wrong to us, but if another man's feeling of right differs from our own we should not attempt to *force* him to do what *we* think is right.

Our task is vastly greater than "gaining" our way. It is to overcome self so we can see reality and can feel the oneness of all life. We then would see beyond classes and races and see people and we would have no life apart from them. To live or to eat with people of various races is unimportant. (To do so does promote our ego.) "If we love beyond the world we cannot be separated by it." To strike against one "brother" to prove our love for another indicates that we have not yet found Truth where all are one. Our real cause is not discrimination and segregation but lust and greed. The real solution is not work or hunger strikes but the purification of our spirit. Our real task then is to bring into being a new man free from lust and greed, detached from selfish desires so he can see Truth and thereby be able to help others find their way to it. Only he who sees Truth can create. When we see things as they are we are already at peace, we are already living in the world of brotherhood. Only when we have found this world of truth and reality can we really help others. To the activist this will seem slow and evasive but this matters not at all. We *are* greatly concerned for the welfare of mankind! Ours is the search for Truth—God—which is the real solution to lust and greed which are the real causes of our sorrow and suffering and of the division among us.

A CO IN PRISON

Christmas Cards

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

I have been getting quite a number of Christmas cards from people of whom I have never heard! It is nice of them and we are very grateful but it is tantalizing and we lie awake nights wondering who is Katherine Calee or Estelle Man or Gordon Nugent or John Haynes, etc. We know in what spirit they send them and it makes us feel all warm inside—as warm, indeed, as I have felt in prison!

Deep emotion seems to be always near the surface in prison; men suddenly become aware of "colds" at the simplest and tenderest moments. It is well that it is so, for I have never before been in a group of men who are more thoughtful, more unselfish in sharing, more understanding in moments of crisis, more bound together by a common misfortune than those I have met here.

Whatever is wrong with the prison setup, it certainly is not the men in it, for one finds some who are thoroughbreds in every way. When one confronts youngsters who have been completely molded by their environment and sees in them the maturity, the courage, the discipline and the tragedy of much older men, then one's heart bleeds for them indeed and I keep thinking, Never mind me, do something about him and him and him! But soon I have a feeling of helplessness and I feel like a medical doctor in the midst of a plague: What use to save individuals if you cannot stem the disease? But yet I insist, we can cure some and though it is small, we have to start at what we can accomplish.

A CO IN PRISON

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

It was a real pleasure for COs here to receive so many Christmas cards from people not on our lists, and we would like to inform people of our appreciation. . . We are getting a real colony of COs here. It truly surpasses anything I found in CPS.

A CO IN PRISON

Attention COs (Female)

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Help is so short here (State Hospital, Marlboro, N. J.) that the CO girls working here have an exceptionally heavy burden in carrying out their tasks, and even then the patients miss much because of lack of care. I have prepared a letter describing the situation and will be glad to send it to anyone interested. (Ed. Note—Please include return postage.)

FRANKLIN SCHROCK

An Open Letter about The Next Peace

It is not a usual thing for any of us to write an "open letter" in order to persuade you to buy one of our publications. I do it only because I think that the present time is not a usual situation.

On the press, as I write, is the latest in our series of FOR studybooks—*The Next Peace*, by R. Alfred Hassler. It is a clear, readable, penetrating discussion of some of the things that are uppermost in our thoughts these days: the problems of the coming peace; the dangers of isolationism; the menace of hatred and greed; the findings of the Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran conferences, and many other matters. All of these it treats from the standpoint of the needs of the human family that is in sharp contrast with the "national interest" treatment accorded such subjects by newspapers, magazines, and radio.

Frankly, I wish every Fellowship member would read *The Next Peace*. I wish every church would use it in classes and discussion groups. I wish every high school student would have a chance to read the youth (Forerunner) edition. Obviously, all those things are not possible, but I know that we can get remarkably wide distribution if you will help us. I would like to ask you to consider doing these things:

1. Get a copy yourself and read. You might subscribe to the whole series — $1.00 for five issues. But at least this one ought to be distributed widely now.

2. Give away copies. Select friends, ministers, teachers, librarians, and others to give to. Send a personal note with each gift. (You may deduct 20% from the price on orders of 10 copies or more.)

3. See if you can get *The Next Peace* introduced into your church study groups. It is published in both adult (Fellowship) and youth (Forerunner) editions. Use it in teaching church school classes.

4. Introduce the youth (Forerunner) edition to sympathetic high school teachers with the recommendation that they use it in their classes. Several teachers already are doing this with others in the series.

But act quickly, please. *The Next Peace* is timely now, because the next peace is being made now.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE.

***The Next Peace* sells for 25¢ per copy.**

Other Publications

THE FALL OF CHRISTIANITY

By G. J. Heering

Foreword by E. Stanley Jones

" . . . of first-rate importance to all who want a clear, scholarly, and fearless statement of the problem Christianity has faced and faces now with regard to war. In view of certain popular, though unthorough, and compromising statements that have gained currency under the stress of war, this book stands out, and its wide reading will do much to clear the air."

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK

Per copy **$1.50**

EXIT EMPIRE

By Vernon Nash

Another of the popular studybooks, in both Fellowship (adult) and Forerunner (youth) editions. Included in subscriptions to studybook series, $1.00 for five issues.

Per copy **.25**

OUTCASTS

By Caleb Foote

The best illustrated popular treatment of the evacuation, internment, and resettlement of the Japanese-Americans.

Per copy **.15**

WAR IS THE ENEMY

By A. J. Muste

This booklet had such wide popularity that continued requests after it had gone "out of print" made it necessary to do a new edition. Now ready.

Per copy **.25**

Literature Department

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.